

PR

JPRS: 2998

27 July 1960

MAIN FILE

FOREWORD TO "SOCIOMETRY, EXPERIMENTAL METHOD AND
THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY," BY J. L. MORENO

- USSR -

by M. Bakhimov

Distributed by:

OFFICE OF TECHNICAL SERVICES
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

Price 10⁵⁰

19990114 121

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

JPRS: 2998

CSO: 3995-N

FOREWORD TO "SOCIOMETRY, EXPERIMENTAL METHOD AND
THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY," BY J. L. MORENO.

/Following is a translation of the Foreword by M. Bakhimov to the book "Sotsiometriya -- Ekspеримен tal'niy Metod i Nauka ob Obshchestve", Moscow, 1958, pages 5-20.7

FOREWORD

The author of this book, Dr. J. Moreno, is the chief exponent of a fashionable trend in contemporary bourgeois sociology in the United States called sociometry or microsociology. Moreno is known in the United States as an outstanding experimental scientist in the field of psychology and psychotherapy. An experimental institute of sociometry in New York has been named after him.

The book's subtitle ("An Approach to a New Political Orientation"), like its entire contents, testifies to the fact that in taking up the problems of so-called "social psychology," Moreno is defending certain specific political doctrines.

Moreno's book represents a collection of articles and speeches by him which were published before and after World War II. This explains the fact of a certain lack of organization and consistency in the presentation, together with repetitions. Some of Moreno's ideas on problems of sociology, set forth in other books and in articles published in the journal, "Sociometry," are only partially treated in the present volume, or are absent altogether. (Cf., for example, the book "Who Shall Survive?", published in 1934 and reprinted in considerably expanded form in 1933.) However, this book gives a more or less complete notion of the basic viewpoints of sociometry and the conclusions Moreno has drawn relative to several important problems of sociology.

A correct understanding of the sociological views of Moreno is complicated by the rather large number of new terms and concepts he uses in explaining social phenomena. Some of

these terms have been borrowed from the German sociologists of the early 20th Century (G. Zimmel, et al.) and from G. Gurvitch, the leader of the French school of microsociology. A considerable part of this new terminology was borrowed by both Moreno and Gurvitch from modern physics, chemistry, and engineering. The following are the terms most frequently employed by Moreno: sociometry, or microsociology; the social microstructure, or the sociometric matrix; the macrostructure of society, or the external officail society; the microscopic elements of society -- social electrons (tele factors), atoms, and molecules, "sociods"; social microlaws; the sociometric proletariat; the sociometric revolution, etc.

Moreno frequently compares his own views with the Marxist theory of society, and writes a good deal about the traits in common between sociometry and Marxism. Thus he speaks of the revolutionary nature of Marxism and of sociometry. Actually, however, there is nothing revolutionary in sociometry as a theory of society. But Moreno most frequently emphasizes the differences between sociometry and Marxism. However, his attempt to set forth sociometry as a more scientific and realistic theory of society than Marxism is merely an inflated declaration.

The fact that Moreno acknowledges the "social tensions" in the contemporary capitalist world and promises to solve "scientifically" the problem of relaxing those tensions and eliminating all social conflicts, his pseudo-revolutionary phraseology, and his prestige as a scientist and psychologist, have created in the eyes of some persons a distorted notion of sociometry as the latest scientific theory of society.

Today many sociological journals in the United States, France, Germany and other capitalist countries are discussing Moreno's discoveries. They see in sociometry an antidote to Marxism-Leninism whose function it is to undermine the theoretical foundations of communism, which Moreno feels it is his inflexible duty to combat.

Also noteworthy are Moreno's typical statements to the effect that the United States is in a "desperate and critical situation." He finds the cause of that situation in the "low cohesion" of American society. Therefore, the chief task of sociometry, according to Moreno, is to develop methods ensuring the transformation of the United States into a country with "high cohesion."

Let us take a closer look at what is represented by this latest ideological weapon of the bourgeois world.

The term 'sociometry' is formed by combining two words: soci(etas), meaning 'society,' and metreo, meaning 'I measure,' which together mean social measurement or the measuring of society. Moreno sees sociometry as not only

the totality of the technical procedures for studying social phenomena proper to so-called microsociology but also those conclusions which he draws from that study. In recent years sociometry has been increasingly divided into applied and theoretical sociometry. Sociometry proper, or applied sociometry, involves conducting experiments with small groups of the population (e.g., groups of pre-school and school age, and neighbors in an apartment building, the employees of an office, teams of industrial workers, etc.). The theoretical part of sociometry is frequently called microsociology, since in it all phenomena are divided into microscopic and macroscopic, with the former being considered the decisive, main force in social development. Apparently having in mind the theoretical aspect of sociometry, Moreno says it "may be defined as microsociology -- the sociology of dynamic microscopic elements." (Quoted in the book by G. Gurvitch, "La Vocation Actuelle de la Sociologie," Paris, 1950, p 244.)

Although Moreno states that sociometry "measures" (studies) all social relations, it is actually concerned chiefly with the psychological aspects of human relations in the aforementioned groups of adults and children. The sociometrists are mainly interested in the emotional side of these relations manifested in feelings of sympathy, antipathy, or indifference as among human beings. A considerable part of the experiments conducted by Moreno and his followers have aimed at bringing to light just such hidden emotional relations among human beings. And this is not a matter of accident, since through them Moreno is trying to find an explanation for all aspects of social life, including the economic and political aspects.

It is well known that Historical Idealism considers that the motive force in history is the "world soul," ideas in general, political institutions, or even goals, ideals engendered in the consciousness of outstanding individuals. For Moreno it is the attractions and the feelings of human beings, instead of social or political institutions, which constitute the decisive factor in the historical process. He calls this "depth sociology," since he has allegedly found deeper foundations for social life than were known to the Idealists and the Materialists. The Idealists of the past did not conceal their own convictions and these political conclusions which were drawn from these convictions. Not so the microsociologists, who disguise their Idealistic views with various new terms and concepts. V.I. Lenin's statement that "Not a single one of these professors, who are capable of doing the most valuable work in special fields of chemistry, history, and physics, should be believed even to the extent of one word once the question of philosophy arises." applies fully to the contemporary sociometrists.

"Sociometry," Moreno writes, "deals with the internal structure of social groups, which can be compared to the nuclear nature of the atom or the physiological structure of the cell" (p. 39). Therefore, he goes on to say, in terms of its system, sociometry can be likened to nuclear physics. As for the so-called "internal structure" (which Moreno usually calls the microstructure or the sociometric matrix), it "consists of various constellations, tele, the atom, the super-atom or molecule (several atoms linked together), the 'sociod', which may be defined as a cluster of atoms linked together with other clusters of atoms via inter-personal chains or networks" (p. 180 of this edition).

One may gether an idea as to the importance which Moreno attributes to this structure from his statement that it "exerts a determining influence upon every sphere in which the factor of human interrelations as an active agent -- in economics, biology, social pathology, politics, government, and similar spheres of social action" (p. 188).

It is precisely the discovery of this structure which Moreno regards as constituting the chief merit of microsociology and its radical difference not only from all known sociological doctrines of the past but from Marxist theory as well.

Moreno declares that Marx was not interested in discovering this "basic structure of human society," and that "he did not even know that it had one" (p. 92). Whence, according to Moreno, flow all of the other theoretical and political "blunders" of Marxism. If we are to judge by Moreno's affirmations, the rise of microsociology means a revolution in human attitudes toward society. He compares the importance of sociometry to the importance of microbiology and nuclear physics. It goes without saying that the discoveries of these two sciences are of tremendous significance. The achievements of microbiology have made it possible to elaborate methods of saving human beings from infectious diseases, and to improve the condition of the soil in order to increase crop yields. Nuclear physics has made it possible to extract from the atomic nucleus the energy contained therein.

Moreno and his followers make use of the fact that the concepts associated with the above discoveries and used in the study of material processes visible only under the microscope or studied with the aid of other complex technical apparatus, have become widely current in modern science. Moreno and the other microsociologists are now using these concepts in analyzing feelings, notions, ideas, aspirations, the will, and other aspects of human psychic behavior. Moreno is right when he says that human psychic life has an internal

subjective character and is manifested in various acts and modes of human behavior, that it is expressed by means of verbal or written language, and is clarified by other means as well; e.g., by mimicry, gestures, etc. If the micro-sociologists had had in mind only the internal, subjective character of the psychic life when they called human feelings, consciousness, and will "microscopic," one would have no quarrel with them. But we are dealing here not merely with names alone, but with the fact that in defining psychic behavior as microscopic, Moreno and his followers mean that psychic behavior plays the decisive role in social life, analogous to the role played by the processes of the microcosm in biological, physical, chemical, and other phenomena.

Moreno's own statements leave no doubt but what these all-powerful micro-factors are in fact the "factors" in human psychic behavior.

"Just as we use the words 'tele-perceptor,' 'telepathy,' 'telencephalon,' 'telephone,' etc., to express action at distance, so to express the simplest unit of feeling transmitted from one individual towards another we use the term 'tele'" (p. 40).

Moreno calls the totality of these "teles" social atoms. "The social atom," he writes, "consists of a large number of telestructures"; it is a "system of attractions and repulsions projected from both sides" -- by the individual toward the group around him, and by the members of this group toward the individual. Elsewhere Moreno calls the social atom an "emotional cuurnt," and considers that these atoms "perform an important function in the development of human society" (p. 56).

Moreno subsequently explains that these atoms combined into molecules, forming "psychological networks" which in their turn function, according to Moreno, as "units" of the microstructure of society as a whole. Thus Moreno's statements as to the decisive role of this structure in all spheres of social life, including the economic and political, contain nothing scientific. They are a disguised form of an Idealistic notion which makes social life dependent upon the psychology of human beings. But human psychology itself depends upon external, real interrelations, and represents a reflection of the conditions of their material life.

One can of course employ various methods for determining the traits of the "psychological relations" among human beings. To a certain extent, even the methods employed by Moreno are usable. When, in his experiments with the members of a certain group of young children, school children, or adults, Moreno poses the problem as to whether the external relations

among them (e.g., group living, group work, group leisure, etc.) correspond to their mutual attractions and hidden feelings, he can of course obtain certain data as to the psychological relations among human beings. However, a real understanding of these relations is not achieved through our knowing what the persons themselves think of them, but as a result of studying their practical relations (in the process of labor, political and social activity, behavior in home surroundings, etc.).

Moreno calls the aforementioned relations "microrelations" or the macrostructure of groups. If, for example, several persons work in the same shop or go fishing together, sit at the same table when they eat, and manifest feelings of sympathy toward one another, this means (according to Moreno) that the macrostructure of these groups corresponds to their microstructure. No conflicts arise in the relations among the members of such groups: they do the work assigned to them in a spirit of teamwork, and their acts are harmonized. In other cases, groups experience conflicts and dissensions which have a negative effect on all of their activity. Moreno describes several experiments showing how he and his followers, by re-organizing the macrostructure of certain groups in accordance with their microstructure, achieved improvement of relations in these groups and a higher degree of cohesion, working capacity, etc.

Moreno utilizes the data from experiments of this kind for far-reaching sociological conclusions relative to the sources of social tensions and conflicts, and methods of regulating them. In his opinion, these sources are to be found in the lack of correspondence between the macrostructure of capitalist society and its microstructure. By way of achieving the "cohesion" and "harmonization" of relations among all individuals, classes, and social groups, Moreno proposes the re-organization of the so-called "macrostructure" of capitalism.

For Moreno, the macrostructure is the chief obstacle to the aforementioned social changes.

"Marxism," he writes, "ascribes the deep resistance to change and revolution to the property owners, the capitalist class. It is not aware that this deep resistance comes directly from the social structure". (Moreno sometimes calls the macrostructure the social structure.)

Thus out of all the external material relations, Moreno isolates as the most important the so-called "macro-relations"; i.e., the strictly spatial grouping of persons which comes about in the course of their performing various production, social, political, cultural, or any other functions.

Moreno promises to solve all contemporary social and political problems by means of regularizing these relationships.

It is known fact that persons are not indifferent to spatial relations of "nearness." Thus it happens that persons unsympathetic to each other are no longer able to tolerate this "nearness," want to avoid future encounters, and try to get away from each other (change their residence, place of employment, place where they spend their vacations, etc.). There is no question but that hostile relations arising (for various causes or on various grounds) among individuals of similar social status can have a negative effect on the life of the given collective. Therefore, there is nothing strange in the fact that in a number of experiments Moreno has confirmed such cases. Society cannot ignore these facts, and must take various measures to normalize this kind of personal relations.

However, there exist not only socially homogeneous groups and collectives but also heterogeneous ones. Therefore, the conditions giving rise to these "tensions" and conflicts, like the character of the conflicts themselves, vary a great deal. Consequently, the methods for solving them cannot be uniform. The chief weakness of Moreno's sociology consists in the fact that he ignores this important fact, that he plays down the radical differences between the non-antagonistic conflicts and contradictions arising even within groups of workers, and the antagonistic, irreconcilable contradictions existing between the workers, the exploited, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie, the exploiters, on the other. Moreno proposes revamping the macrostructure of the capitalist society, apparently on the assumption that class antagonism in the capitalist society arises on the same basis and had the same character as the quarrels, disagreements, and conflicts in groups of schoolchildren, in the family, in groups of workers, and in other groups and collectives. It suffices to take note of certain facts in order to convince oneself of the complete untenability of these basic positions in Moreno's conclusions.

As we have noted, Moreno acknowledges that the American society is passing through a crisis -- due, he says, to the low cohesion of the American nation. One clear and very convincing proof of this is the striking of the American workers and the struggle of the American people for democratic transformations. But does this really have any relation to the so-called "macrostructure" of American society or the macrostructure of the worker's groups and other groups of the population?

As we know, workers' strikes happen as a result of unbearable working conditions, low pay, illegal lay-offs, of workers, and other economic and political factors. Therefore, striking workers do not demand the "regularization" of the macrostructure of their own groups or permission to reorganize them in accordance with their "attractions"; they strive for radical changes in the social system, and liberation from capitalist exploitation and political oppression. The attempts of Moreno and his colleagues to distract the attention of the workers by appeals for a "radical" reorganization of the macrostructure of capitalism serve, on the objective plane, the interests of those for whom the preservation of exploitation is profitable.

No amount of talking about the macrostructure of capitalism can disguise the existence of the capitalist economic system and the class, antagonistic contradictions proper to that system. Today, even certain bourgeois economists and sociologists have been compelled to write that the United States, France, Britain, and several other capitalist countries are dominated by a handful of monopolists who have seized the key positions in the economy and governmental apparatus of those countries.

On the basis of these very self-evident facts, the Marxist-Leninist science of society, Historical Materialism, considers that without annihilating the domination of the capitalist monopolies and establishing a genuinely popular socialist system there can be no significant cohesion of society and no elimination of social conflicts.

Understanding that one cannot speak of scientific sociology while not touching upon the problems of the exploitation of the workers by the capitalists, upon the class structure of society, social revolutions, etc., Moreno gives his own answers to these problems. In this connection he feels that he has succeeded in freeing himself from the "one-sided character" and "false" extremes of the bourgeois and Marxist sociologies. This of course constitutes his great illusion. As for the "neutral position" of Moreno, one can judge this on the basis of his conclusions relative to the economic basis of capitalism. ("The Pathology of the Economy in the United States and the USSR," pp 28, 29, and 30.)

According to Moreno, capitalist production has a "universal character," since "the natural resources, the creativity and spontaneity preceding the labor process" do not belong to any individual or particular group; they belong "to the universe." Therefore, Moreno concludes, there is no sense in the question: "To whom does the finished product of labor belong?"

Moreno is excessively naive when he assumes that in thus "universalizing" the foundations of the capitalist economy he has succeeded in minimizing its exploitative character. A considerable part of the natural resources in the form of deposits of ore, coal, petroleum, and other raw materials were long ago seized by the capitalist monopolies and utilized by them for purposes of making profits. As for "creativity" and "spontaneity," it is well known into whose pocket go the results of the creative rationalization of capitalist production and the "spontaneously" developing scientific and technological thought.

Foreseeing that very few people will believe in his "universalization" of the capitalist economy, and understanding that the fact of the exploitation of the workers cannot be so easily concealed, Moreno tries to revise the law of surplus value discovered by Marx. As we know, this law explains the mechanics of capitalist exploitation and shows the source of the unearned income and wealth of the capitalist class. The importance of this law is indicated by the fact that Lenin called it the cornerstone of the economic theory of K. Marx. Naturally, Moreno does not attempt directly to deny the existence of surplus value. He intends "merely" to bring the law of surplus value under his own "universal sociodynamic law," or law of "sociodynamic effect," and thus to reduce it to nothing (Sometimes Moreno calls this mythical law "the law of surplus choice.")

He writes that surplus value is a "particular case," a "symptom," a "reflection," a "dramatized form" of his eternal law. He concludes that it is unscientific and primitive to make a revolution in order to eliminate the "symptoms" without getting at the causes. But what are these causes? A clarification of them will enable us better to see what mocrisociology boils down to in attempting to solve basic theoretical problems.

According to Moreno, this law expresses the unequal distribution among human beings of so-called "emotional choices"; i.e., the aforementioned feelings of sympathy, preference, respect, etc. Moreno affirms that some persons secure the lion's share of these choices, which does not correspond to their needs and capacities, while many others are not chosen. Moreover, the tendency of these choices consists in the fact that the larger the group and the quantity of choices, the more are secured by the so-called "stars" -- the top part of the group. According to Moreno, this leads to a "gap between the small group of stars, the middle groups, and the neglected groups." (J. L. Moreno, "Who Shall Survive?" pp 697-698.)

First of all one should note the complete absurdity of the analogy Moreno tries to draw between the law of surplus value, which explains how the capitalists appropriate a considerable part of the worker's labor, and the so-called "microlaw of surplus choice," or "super-profits." Feelings of respect, attachment, and admiration are manifestations of human psychic behavior. They vary in accordance with the conditions of people's lives. The economic relations of capitalism, which are built on the exploitation of another's labor and have an historically transient character, are quite a different thing. They are material. These relations, however much they are "dramatized," cannot serve as a particular case of psychological relations. Social science says something quite different: it says that psychological relations among human beings more or less accurately reflect their economic relations. Therefore, the character and degree of any particular psychological preferences among individuals must be sought in their real relations.

Also, the microlaw of "surplus choice" is false in its very foundation by virtue of the fact that there is no direct proportional ratio between the quantity of choices going to the known and recognized "authorities" and "stars" of the capitalist world, and the overall quantity of choices.

With the general growth in the awareness and activeness of the masses in the capitalist society, completely opposed processes are taking place. The bourgeois politicians and public figures are increasingly losing their influence over the masses; there is, to use the language of the microsociologists, a diminution of their "super-choice," while sympathy toward representatives of revolution, really and honestly serving the interests of the people, is growing and becoming stronger. The masses are gaining an ever deeper understanding of the truth of Marxism-Leninism.

Moreno's claims to have explained the social phenomena associated with the growth or diminution of the number of followers and partisans of "recognized authorities" have proven empty and of no value, since in addition to a purely quantitative analysis of the kind typical of Moreno, these phenomena require an analysis of the actual relations developing between the authorities and the rank-and-file members of the given group.

The regrets expressed by Moreno because the number of those rich in surplus choices is extremely small, while there are too many of those poor in such choices, are intended to conceal the actual class division of the capitalist society into a handful of exploiters and a huge mass of exploited.

It is generally known that bourgeois statistics is finding it increasingly difficult to conceal the fact of the exploitation of the workers in the capitalist countries. Moreno is opposed to exploitation; but under the inflexible condition that the very concept of exploitation be "re-evaluated" and "expanded."

Moreno says that exploitation exists, but that the exploiters include not only the capitalists but also the workers, who together with the capitalists exploit scientific ideas and technical inventions created by the unaided scientific geniuses of all times. Here the economic concept of exploitation is confused with the concept of the utilization of the technical resources of production. For Moreno, the exploited "minority" is the technical intelligentsia and scientists; and liberating mankind from exploitation boils down to creating more favorable conditions for the technical intelligentsia and scientists to sell their inventions and discoveries. In this connection Moreno promises the advent of so-called "creatocracy," under which there will be no exploitation.

It should be noted that a considerable part of the technical intelligentsia serving capitalist industry is being robbed by the capitalists through the acquisition of its inventions and experience in scientific production organization at a very low price. However, a certain portion of this intelligentsia, having been able profitably to sell their inventions and get rich, have become direct participants in the exploitation of the workers' labor. Thus the "creatocracy" called for by Moreno is a society in which the capitalists must continue to exist, but where they must be more "generous" with respect to paying for the work of the inventors so that with the aid of the latter they can achieve more modern methods of exploiting the workers.

Such is the unarticulated major premise of the attempts at "expanding" the concept of exploitation. Having thus "solved" the problem of exploitation, Moreno proceeds to the question of how relations between workers and entrepreneurs should be structured. The only thing he can offer to either party is that they should conclude mutually advantageous labor agreements.

Naturally, the conclusion of labor agreements is of considerable importance in the workers' economic struggle against the capitalists. But however good these agreements may be, they do not change the system of capitalist exploitation itself; and they serve chiefly to enable the proletariat to sell its manpower more profitably. The microsociologists' attempts to elevate such agreements to the position of the only and most important *[sic]* means of solving contradictions

under capitalism, constitute a tacit justification of the capitalist system. This is probably most clearly manifested in Moreno's statements on the proletariat and social revolutions. Here Moreno bases his arguments on the general premises of his own sociometry, which shifts all questions of social life to the sphere of psychological relations. Therefore, in those cases when he discusses the social classes of the contemporary bourgeois society, he means not the actually existing classes (the bourgeoisie and the proletariat) but so-called "socoids"; viz., large groups of people united by feelings of sympathy toward one another. Moreno declares that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are a "pre-sociometric myth." There exist only "sociometric classes" including a "sociometric proletariat." Moreno considers that the distinguishing trait of the latter is suffering from poverty -- a poverty which is "psychological, social, economic, political, racial, and religious." Moreno is ready to recognize any form of poverty from which his proletariat suffers; but he does not recognize that the existence of the proletariat is due to a specific capitalist mode of production based on the exploitation of the proletariat.

Moreno intends to "expand" the concept of the proletarian -- to make it cover all types of "poverty" -- so that he can then say that since there will always be people with varying "attractions," a greater or less degree of "spontaneity," and "productivity," there can be no question of the disappearance of the proletariat in the future. Moreno wants his "proletariat" to utilize to the fullest its capacities at capitalist enterprises in the name of the further enrichment of the capitalist class. This is the upshot of his statements on the "sociometric revolution," which has no relationship to genuine revolution, since it does not involve any change in the bourgeois social system.

Moreno relates the concept of revolution, of "radical changes," to changes in the aforementioned area of the macro-structure of capitalism. But this has about as much relation to a change in the social system as do the frequent replacements of certain cabinet members by others in the governmental organs of the United States.

Moreno's appeals for "revolution," "radical action," and "the creation of the foundations of a new social system... worthy of the highest claims of all times," as he writes, have an extremely demagogic and deliberately enticing character. This is borne out by his numerous warnings and reminders that revolution is by no means what the Marxists say it is. As we know, a socialist revolution annihilates the rule of the capitalist class and establishes a genuinely popular regime utilized by the workers and all of the common people to

build a classless communist society. But all classes participate in Moreno's "revolution." Moreno's pronouncements on the "revolution for all," a revolution which leaves unchanged the exploitative social system of capitalism, might possibly be interpreted as the honest mistakes of a learned sociologist living in an ivory tower who believes in the good intentions of the exploiters. But the unconcealed hatred for communism and the appeals for "putting an end to the spreading of the idea of communism," together with the frank acknowledgements that the basic political task of microsociology is the "prevention of social revolutions in the future," leaves no doubt that all of the microsociologists' talk of a sociometric revolution is aimed only at deluding the common people and distracting them from the struggle against the oppression of the capitalist monopolies and the role of the imperialists.

But how is one to explain the fact that certain enemies of socialist revolution and communism are nonetheless compelled to use the disguise of "revolutionary" phrases? This is due to the great attractive force of the achievements of socialist revolution, which has been victorious in the Soviet Union and has liberated many other peoples in Europe and Asia from the imperialist yoke, enabling them to build a free and happy life without exploiters and parasites.

Increasingly broader strata of the peoples of capitalist countries are becoming convinced on the basis of their own experience that radical improvement of their position can be achieved only with the annihilation of the rule of the imperialists.

Progressive thinkers among the common people understand very well the delusory and reactionary character of the declarations of the right-wing socialist leaders regarding the "democratization" and "development" of capitalism into socialism. And they also understand the actual, undemocratic aims of the "sociometric revolution." It will be rejected, regardless of whatever deceptive phrases may be written about it by Moreno and his colleagues in microsociology.

As an outstanding scientist and psychologist, Moreno could of course have manifested more feeling for reality in understanding the doomed state of the exploitative social system, the inevitability of the victory of the principles of communism, which embody genuinely human feelings. This is all the more worthy of emphasis, since Moreno takes a stand for peace and peaceful coexistence. A sober evaluation of the adventurist character of the policies of the imperialists, aimed at unleashing a new war, has enabled Moreno to judge of the reckless undemocratic policies of the ruling circles of the imperialist states.

In summarizing the foregoing, it should be noted that Moreno's statements that his sociometry (microsociology), like Marxism, has a "revolutionary character" and requires "radical changes in the existing social system," do not square with his above viewpoints on solving the basic theoretical and ideological problems of modern life. In these matters he remains the ideological defenders of the outmoded capitalist world.

END

#1162

14

THIS PUBLICATION WAS PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT TO THE
UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE,
A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ESTABLISHED
TO SERVICE THE TRANSLATION AND RESEARCH NEEDS
OF THE VARIOUS GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.